UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,926	09/11/2003	Mazen Chmaytelli	990545	8382
	7590 12/03/201 INCORPORATED	EXAMINER		
5775 MOREHO	OUSE DR.	HALIYUR, VENKATESH N		
SAN DIEGO, C	A 92121		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2476	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/661,926	CHMAYTELLI ET A	L.	
Examiner	Art Unit		

	VENKATESH HALIYUR	2476	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	octed claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / amonamone (	1 1 0 2 0 2 1 //
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo	<del></del>	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).		<b>,</b>	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <i>1-19.21-29.31-35</i> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19,21-29,31-35</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	•	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Venkatesh Haliyur/	/Salman Ahmed/		
Examiner, Art Unit 2476	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2476	
	,		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendments filed on 11/15/2010 overcomes the objections of claims 1,10,11,21 as made in the final office action of 09/15/2010 but the amendments raises new issues that would require further search as the amendments are very broad as the classified and/or unclassified incoming communication request and default responses are not defined in independent claims.

With respect to applicants arguments for claims 1-19, 21-29, 31-35 that Brown, Payne and Mizikovsky fail to teach the feature of a cllular telephone configured to classify incoming communications and Payne fail to disclose the limitation of "a processor configured to request a user to classify the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when it is determined that no default response exists and to allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the attempted incoming communication connection or when it is determined that the user did not respond to the request to classify, and upon an attempted unidentifiable incoming communication, requests the user to provide a classification for the unidentifiable incoming communication, however the examiner respectfully disagree as Brown disclosed the accepting an incoming call based on a call classification and unidentified classification in a telephone system comprising wired and wireless telephones and responses (para 0047,0124, 0133,0135, 0140, Figs 1,4). Payne discolsed the call classification fetaures and responses for mobile phone systems (col 7, lines 32-56,col 9, lines 4-20, abstract) and Mizikovsky disclosed a method to classify (function category, item 108 of Fig 2) the attempted incoming communication connection using the identifying information (item 310 of Fig 3) when it is determined that the incoming communication can be classified (col 4, lines 22-64) or when it is determined that a default response exists (response categories set by the user, col 6, lines 44-67); request a user to classify the attempted incoming communication and determine whether the user responded to the request when it is determined that no default response exists (col 7, lines 50-62, Fig 1); classify the attempted incoming communication connection based upon a classification by the user when it is determined that the user classified the incoming communication (col 7, lines 63-67); perform the predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication connection based upon the classification when it is determined that there is a predetermined response (col 7, lines 32-38) and allow connection of the incoming communication when it is determined that there is not a predetermined response to the attempted incoming communication (col 8, lines 14-19. Fig 5, abstract). Therefore obviousness can be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (Please see the specification paragraphs [0014-0018] and sections pertaining to related art [0002-0006]) are not recited in the rejected independent claim(s). Therefore the examiner respectfully suggests applicants to define the classified and unclassifed incoming communication and how the default responses are made that pertains to data call, phone call and SMS features. /V.H/